

**Project / Executive Summary:**

Technical	Business	Schedule
Yellow (S)	Green (D)	Green (S)

I = Improving   D = Deteriorating   S = Stable

**Technical:**

- Saber moved onto the Citrix Secure Software (CSS) on Sunday January 6<sup>th</sup>. In the first several days after the switchover it was discovered that many of the counties were still attempting to access site 2 due to the presence of connection strings in their respective client machines. The users experienced system slowdowns and total lock-ups of the SCORE application. The problem only affected pilot counties as they were the only group requested to add the connection strings during the pilot rollout. Saber was under the impression that the connection strings had been removed through an earlier request. This once again puts into question Saber's ability to manage an enterprise application and infrastructure.
- Citrix has provided feedback to Saber on the CAG issue progress. Saber provided the information and it is currently being evaluated by State and IV&V. The plan is to test the Citrix CAG changes over the course of the next two weeks. If the changes produce an environment void of Citrix and SSL problems, as a result of the internal and external testing, the site will be converted to the CSS software.
- The Performance & Security deliverable remains outstanding. Saber has made progress in testing a Citrix load tool (Appslload). Saber has indicated they have started back into planning for the P&S testing. The SCORE IV&V will continue to monitor progress and be a part of both the independent (i-Beta) and internal (Saber) testing. The SCORE IV&V expects extrapolated testing during the February timeframe and full load / stress testing to occur in conjunction with the Statewide Mock election in the April timeframe.
- The SCORE IV&V has begun planning for the next round of Independent Security Testing. The testing will be conducted at the end of February in support of the users being brought up on both sites. This test will be graded in anticipation of the overall Statewide test to be conducted in conjunction with the Statewide Mock election in the April timeframe. The SCORE IV&V expects to see improvements made to the infrastructure from the previous testing and that the logs and supporting information has been cleaned up as needed to provide critical information to Saber and the State as to how the infrastructure is performing and to maintain focus on the security of the system.
- As requested by Saber, they delivered an Indicative monitoring tool distribution report for the current installation scheme along with a plan for adding additional licenses. The request for the information was made after critical network data was not available through the current monitoring data points. Saber is requesting a total of 5378 additional licenses be procured. It is unclear if these are additional licenses or just data points under the licenses. Regardless, the SCORE IV&V has concerns about the over head these additional data points will cost, and how the additional information will be tracked within the log files. A meeting with State and Saber is planned over the next reporting periods.

- Closure on the procurement of additional hardware / software needs to be addressed in order to allow Saber and the project to move forward. Outstanding are official decisions on the Test Platform, additional SSL certificates, additional SAN disk drives, additional database memory, and additional Citrix licenses. The additional purchases need to be in place for the Mock election period starting this April. A discussion was conducted during the Steering committee over the period. The SCORE IV&V recommends that each of the additions be documented on Change Control Forms and go through the formal CCB process. This process should make the in or out of scope determination and document whether the State or Saber pay for the changes.

**Business:**

- The SCORE Round Table discussion at the Colorado County Clerk Association winter conference produced some open and honest feedback from the counties. The roundtable board included the pilot counties and two Group 1 counties (Logan / Mesa). The discussion was well organized and produced both positive and negative comments. It appears that Larimer County is struggling to adopt SCORE as their primary system. Larimer made very specific comments on the increased data entry time and network support. Although other counties were having some issues with SCORE functionality and availability, Larimer is the most vocal about their issues. This negative discussion prompted a number of questions from the county audience, and fueled some general negativity toward the project. El Paso along with other smaller pilot counties provided some positive feedback that addressed some of the Larimer issues.
- Statistics on the Group 1 county access to the SCORE system are not showing the level of use expected. The login and transaction reports are showing limited use, and may indicate that counties are continuing to use their legacy systems. The SCORE IV&V was only aware that Denver County intended to continue to use their legacy through the 2008 Caucus generation. This will be discussed at next period's Steering Committee meeting.
- The SCORE IV&V continues to see issues inside of planned releases which are outside of the established list provided by the Score Task Force (STF). The STF and or CCB need to have a clear and concise picture of what is in every release. The credibility of the two groups will be questioned if the process cannot be better defined and controlled.
- The decertification of the majority of the states voting equipment has added an additional load to the counties during the critical Statewide rollout period. The additional potential work load and planning distraction may cause some of the counties to pull back from their SCORE commitments. In discussing the issues with the Secretary of State, he believes that the re-testing and proposed legislation will mitigate this risk. The risk was re-addressed in this status report.
- County participation in the SCORE software testing declined for the 3.2 release due to the County Clerk Conference and county workload. The 3.2 release date was extended for a week to allow counties more time to test. If the trend continues for version 3.5 and 4.0, additional counties may need to be involved in the process. The current consensus of the State, SCORE Task Force and Saber is to keep the group tight through the 4.0 release.

- The CDOS Elections Director has established the SCORE Task Force to address and set the priority of the issues and enhancements being developed. The SCORE IV&V is being included in the task force. The SCORE IV&V's role will be limited to advisory and restricted by the contractual priorities of the project. The SCORE IV&V will continue to attend meetings as the topics dictate. The SCORE IV&V PM will attend task force meeting as topics and time permits. The priority of the outstanding items may need to be re-visited as the issues grow and additional counties are added to the project keeping the 2008 Election Calendar as the key driver.
- Due to the success and feedback on the Group 1 Statewide training class, the SCORE IV&V is reducing their attendance in the subsequent Groups. The SCORE IV&V PM will attend each opening day kick-off and the last day wrap-up. The Voter Registration subject matter expert will attend a morning session in the middle of the week to assure no significant changes in quality or materials have occurred

**Schedule:**

- The shift of the Petitions module out of the 3.2 priority bucket may cause a delay to important 3.5 Election Management enhancements. The impact to this change has not yet been discussed with Saber. The STF will need to re-evaluate the 3.5 priorities to determine if they are needed to support the planned Mock Election in the April timeframe. Due to the many outstanding issues (application / infrastructure), Saber has a very tight window to get all the corrections into place and tested before the beginning of February 3.5 release.
- Due to the delay in the Votec extract changes, there is a high potential that the Statewide rollout counties will need to make manual changes to their data once on the SCORE systems. Saber has indicated they can do some scripted migration word on changes that affect single voters, but those issues affecting multiple voters i.e. address library would need to be done manually. The impact of this has not been accessed. The Votec pilot counties need to be queried as to the time taken to make these changes and any lessons learned or potential automation of the process needs to be explored.

**Accomplishments:**

- The SCORE IV&V and State successfully Smoke Tested Priority 3.2 in QA environment. The test was planned for the UAT environment but was delayed due to required changes to the database schema. This produced no significant issues and the recommendation was made to allow the counties to begin testing. The SCORE IV&V working with the State have tested 93 of the 109 issues during the period. The issues / enhancements have passed at a 91% success rate. The SCORE IV&V is working with Saber on those issues that have failed to this point.
- The SCORE IV&V successfully installed the latest source code release on the Escrow server. The release was smoke tested and can be used to verify source code changes. The process continues to have issues with the database installation that require manual intervention to the provided scripts. The disks did not include the Vote Center modules as expected. A copy of the Vote Center and Database is to be provided by Saber during the next period. A copy was received late in the period. The updates will be deferred until early next week.
- The SCORE IV&V continued to perform Acceptance Testing over the period. The new goal is to complete the entire 1540 test cases by the completion of the Statewide rollout (March 2008).

This will allow Saber enough time to address the issues by the Priority # 3.5 implementation date. The HAVA compliance has risen to 80%. Provisional ballots are the only component not tested to this point. Testing will continue with each release of the application. There are 2 issues related to HAVA compliance: Agency interface implementation for state and Provisional Ballots. The analysis for the Colorado statutes has been completed at this time, but cannot be implemented until 3.5 bucket.

- The SCORE II PMO and IV&V continue to review and respond to multiple Saber Plans and deliverables. The SCORE IV&V has shifted two of its Quality Assurance and Voter Registration / Election Management subject matter experts to performing Acceptance Testing and finalizing the User Acceptance Testing support for the Priority #3.2 & 3.5 issues. In addition, the Security and Infrastructure resources are being re-directed toward the Independent Security Testing findings follow-up. This movement supports the Graded Approach scheme with emphasis toward product or application not paper deliverables.

**Management Attention:** *None in the period*

**Information:**

- The SCORE IV&V is recommending that the CDOR file be reviewed by a CDOS representative. CDOR is currently sending duplicate information on the next day for the same voter. SCORE does not have a way to filter these duplicate CDOR records out of the process. The issue is being discussed in the period with the project team.
- The Saber Data Migration process calls for fields that do not comply with database and business rules to be changed during the migration process. Those changes are not currently being documented inside the legacy system. The SCORE IV&V recommends that whenever a data field is changed in the data migration process that an activity record be generated describing the change and the timing of the change. This information has been verified and will be removed. It is not clear when the information will be loaded during the Statewide rollout waves. This will be tracked as an issue until the data is loaded for the remainder of the counties.
- The SCORE IV&V continues to monitor outside influences including the status of other states HAVA implementation. The information is used to assess the SCORE II project. The next meeting of the SCORE IV&V Executive Steering Committee has been scheduled for 3/11/2008.
- The SCORE IV&V is addressing the weekly code drops in between major releases code drops. This is unplanned testing which was not part of the original scope of work. The State should re-evaluate the use of an automated tool for testing.
- The SCORE IV&V continues to request the configurations settings IDS/IPS and updated switches/routers and firewall. The information was requested as part of the initial Internal Security Testing.
- During the previous Code review audit a large amount of “unused” code was identified in the customized Colorado code. It was agreed at the time that the code would not be removed until after the 3.0 Priority release of the application. Saber indicated in the last status meeting that they do not recommend cleaning up the code until the Version 5.0. The SCORE IV&V & PMO agree with this decision.

**Schedule / Activities & Tasks:**

<b>Completed &amp; Planned Activities / Tasks</b>		
<b>Completed Last Week</b>		
<b>Activity / Task</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
SCORE Steering Committee Meeting	1/15/2008	High
SCORE County / Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion	1/16/2008	High
SCORE IV&V Contract Extension Discussion	1/17/2008	High
Priority 3.2 Testing	1/18/2008	High
SCORE Escrow - Vote Center Load - Smoke test	1/18/2008	High
SCORE IV&V Audits (Licenses, Performance, Code Review)	1/18/2008	High
Continue to respond to Saber Deliverables and Activities (DED's)	1/18/2008	High
<b>Plan for Next Week</b>		
<b>Activity / Task</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
SCORE IT Users Group Meeting	1/23/2008	High
SCORE Escrow - Vote Center Load - Smoke test	1/23/2008	High
SCORE Emergency CCB Meeting	1/24/2008	High
SCORE Group 2 Training Observation / Participation	1/25/2008	High
SCORE IV&V Contract Extension Follow-up Actions	1/25/2008	High
Priority 3.2 Testing / End of Day Review	1/25/2008	High
SCORE IV&V Audits (Licenses, Performance, Code Review)	1/25/2008	High
Continue to respond to Saber Deliverables and Activities (DED's)	1/25/2008	High

**Staffing: As of 11/30/2007:**

<b>Resource Type / Role</b>	<b>Contract Hours</b>	<b>Hours Used to date</b>	<b>% Used</b>	<b>Hours in Period</b>
Project Management	2347.00	2323.50	99%	171.00
Infrastructure / Disaster Recovery SME	289.00	391.25	135%	3.50
Application / Infrastructure SME	737.00	268.75	36%	3.00
Oracle / Application SME	630.00	165.00	26%	8.00
Voter Registration / Election Management SME	1206.00	1,208.00	100%	90.00
Quality Assurance SME's	2369.00	2,259.00	95%	153.00
Security SME's	860.00	774.25	90%	78.75
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8438.00</b>	<b>7389.75</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>507.25</b>

<b>Planned Activities</b>	<b>Contract Hours</b>	<b>Hours Used to date</b>	<b>% Used</b>	<b>Hours in Period</b>
Project Management (Status Reports / Meetings)	1599	2221.75	139%	217.50
Source Code Escrow Responsibilities	180	27.00	15%	0.00
Saber / SCORE II Deliverables / Activities Review	3599	1813.75	50%	55.75
SCORE II Independent Assessments (Security...)	544	744.50	137%	79.00
SCORE II Acceptance Testing (User / System)	1940	2244.75	116%	155.00
SCORE II Project Audits	576	338.00	59%	0.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8438</b>	<b>7389.75</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>507.25</b>

**Acceptance Testing for V.1.6.0 code baseline - Test Case Execution:**

Total Cases	1540	100%	HAVA Requirements		Total Bugs	
Pass	732	48%	Pass	80%	Critical	0
Fail	156	10%	Fail **	20%	High	61
N/A	68	4%	Block	0%	Medium	68
Block	2	0%	Total Req.	100%	Low	72
Total Tested	958	62%			Closed	215
Total to be Executed	581	38%			Total	416

\*\* Provisional Ballots are still an issue with the system. Requirements have been gathered and scheduled Priority 3.5 for the Provisional Ballot Process.

Priority 3.2 Release - 109 Test Cases: 85 Pass, 8 Fail and 16 to Test

Emergency December Release - 3 Test Cases: 3 Pass

Priority 3.0 Release - 168 Test Cases: 47 Pass, 4 Fail, 3 Incomplete and 135 to Test

Priority 2.7 Release - 84 Test Cases: 64 Pass and 20 to Test

Emergency October Release - 6 Test Cases: 6 Pass

Functional Area	Total Cases	Cases Executed	Cases Passed	Percent Complete	Percent Passed
Absentee Application	55	47	39	85%	83%
Address	103	85	79	83%	93%
Administration	85	45	39	53%	87%
Ballot	61	52	34	85%	65%
Calendar	18	1	0	6%	0%
Candidate	25	13	13	52%	100%
Contacts	14	8	8	57%	100%
Contest	17	10	10	59%	100%
Districts	56	56	53	100%	95%
Document Management	7	7	7	100%	100%
Elections	169	111	95	66%	86%
Election Workers	33	20	19	61%	95%
Exports	5	4	3	80%	75%
Help	2	0	0	0%	0
Interfaces	22	7	7	32%	100%
Miscellaneous	18	15	6	83%	40%
Performance	16	9	8	56%	89%
Petition	37	20	19	54%	95%
Poll Book	28	7	7	25%	100%
Polling Places	26	10	10	38%	100%
Reports, Labels and Mailings	205	68	29	33%	43%



Scheduler	19	0	0	0%	0
Software/Hardware Compatibility	10	2	2	20%	100%
System	102	11	9	11%	82%
Voter Management	406	271	227	67%	84%
<b>Totals:</b>	1539	879	723	57%	82%
Category		Total		Percent	
Total Test Cases		1540		100%	
Pass		732		48%	
Fail		156		10%	
N/A		68		4%	
Block		2		0%	
Total Executed		958		62%	
Total to be Executed		581		38%	

**Issues:** (Last Reviewed on 01/05/2008)

Issue ID:	Entry Date:	Modified Date:	Description:	Category	Status
II-001	Monday, November 6, 2006 7:36:58 AM MST	Sunday, December 3, 2006 1:03:56 PM MST	Potential higher total cost of ownership for maintaining a Colorado version of the software. Mitigation: Monitor customization costs closely and take advantage of other States customized code when possible.	Technical	Open
II-010	Sunday, December 3, 2006 12:10:59 PM MST	Sunday, January 28, 2007 8:02:18 PM MST	Exploits move rapidly, and appropriate mindset for threat and new vulnerability thinking are required to respond proactively and protect systems according to their asset value. There is no apparent threat modeling process to feed into risk-based methodology. In order to be able to protect assets by value, the threat to those assets must be understood. Require Saber to develop cohesive threat modeling methodology as part of the SCORE Security Plan. (updated 1/28/07 BP)	Technical	Open
II-019	Wednesday, November 15, 2006 3:56:46 PM MST	Tuesday, December 12, 2006 8:25:18 AM MST	How will a county print poll books if the printer fails on the weekend before an election. This same problem could occur if a Branch or County loses power the weekend before an election, but gets it restored on Monday before the Tuesday Election. Two real life examples follow: I had to run the poll books here at SOS and then printed them in the neighboring county. (Lake and Mineral) I also ran them at SOS and printed them at SOS and then had them delivered to the county. (Elbert)	Technical	Open
II-028	Tuesday, December 12, 2006 2:00:39 PM MST	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:29:42 PM MST	Once the SCORE system becomes the system of record, the State needs to give the counties some guidance on how to "retire" their legacy systems. This should include a listing of the data that will be maintained by the State as part of the data conversion process.	Business	Open
II-030	Sunday, January 7, 2007 3:42:37 PM MST	Tuesday, May 8, 2007 7:29:51 AM MDT	SCORE IV&V reviewed the final document for the Tech Arch Design to see if how/when patches are applied is adequately addressed (Finding 34 in State Review - Technical Architecture Design - 12-Dec-06 - V2.doc) Findings Include: On page 24 of the Final Technical Architecture Design, the last sentence under "Database Failure": Please see the section "Hardware planning" for understanding the process on how software/patches or releases are applied to the SCORE II architecture. Per the Table of Contents, the "Hardware Planning" section is pages 10-29. At no point is there a clear process for maintenance or emergency patching including the testing and migration of these patches.	IV&V Internal	Open
II-031	Thursday, January 4, 2007 10:26:08 AM MST	Tuesday, January 9, 2007 4:16:21 PM MST	Verification and Validation of the power Recptical requirements for the HP Cabinets and the connection provided within the e-FOR3T and CDOS Data Centers should be validated prior to shipment and installation of electrical connectors to insure proper alignment of recptical requirements and services.	Technical	Open
II-040	Friday, January 26, 2007 7:35:43 AM MST	Tuesday, January 30, 2007 2:31:16 PM MST	When the relationship between Saber and CDOS has expired, how will the confidential information (data) be disposed?	Business	Open
II-042	Wednesday, February 7, 2007 6:13:38 AM MST	Wednesday, February 7, 2007 6:13:38 AM MST	The Saber Quality Plan indicates that Saber will conduct periodic Quality Audits. They are currently not identified in the project schedule.	Schedule	Open
II-047	Monday, February 12, 2007 6:37:30 AM MST	Monday, February 12, 2007 6:37:30 AM MST	The typical DRP (Disaster Recovery Procedure) should be its own document and distributed across multiple independent documents. System Maintenance Guide contains the bulk of the true DRP type information. A DRP should be a step-by-step guide to continue business / recover from any type of disaster. It is the desire of the State to use this plan beyond the life of the project and well into the program. Saber has indicated they will provide this as part of the transition plan.	Technical	Open
			Numerous concerns about the lack of visible progress on development and implementation of the web based functionality of VPA, Early Voting and Vote Centers all sum to a high risk for the project. There are questions and clarifications that were raised at		



II-068	Monday, February 19, 2007 5:52:15 AM MST	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:31:54 PM MST	<p>the very beginning of the project about the architecture for the web based interfaces. These have not been closed in the Technical Architecture document and as of this time, serious concerns exist as to whether Saber can deliver this functionality. At a minimum, the Technical Architecture, Security Plans, and Testing Plans should all have details of this implementation. The recent indication that this delivery would be delayed brings to a head the question of exactly who is working on this, and what progress has been made.</p>	Technical	Open
II-069	Sunday, February 18, 2007 10:06:01 AM MST	Monday, February 19, 2007 11:05:45 AM MST	<p>System Test Plan Finding 87The plan does not have a clear process for configuration set ups or changes to set ups that need to occur after initial set up. Non-code related hardware and software changes should be addressed in how changes will be made, tracked, migrated, tested and documented to minimize issues arising from these changes.</p>	Technical	Open
II-070	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 10:59:28 AM MST	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:31:33 PM MST	<p>During the Hardware Installation Inventory IV&amp;V it was discovered that the Network Hardware components had been secured at the front plate of the unite into the cabinet. This installation leaves a significant portion of the Network Component weight unsupported placing significant stress on the securing bracket and the Network Hardware component. This could pose significant risk during the movement of the cabinets, such as the transition form e-FOR3T hosting facility to the CDOS Hosting Center. It is recommended that additional support bracketing be applied to secure the network hardware components.</p>	Technical	Open
II-071	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:48:44 AM MST	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:48:44 AM MST	<p>The document stops short of providing a complete or industry standard SLA with penalties and rewards associated with the target metrics. It is not clear when or if an SLA will be provided. This may be associated with the Platinum Support Contract once the system is placed into production. Production needs to be defined as the period of time when one or more counties are up on the SCORE system.ASIM: 3/3/2007: We can define when production starts. Added the following line:SCORE II system status will be production, once at least one county has moved to production.Penalties and rewards will be based on the contract. State needs to know more about Platinum.First Paragraph - "Under the agreed upon service-level agreement" Needs to be clarified. Is this a separate SLA, part of the Platinum Support Agreement, or assumed as part of this agreement. ASIM 3/3/3007: This is part of the project, as agreed on the RFP.The SCORE IV&amp;V will carry this as an issue until the Platinum Support Contract is documented.</p>	Technical	Open
II-072	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:51:44 AM MST	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:51:44 AM MST	<p>Security needs to be specifically included in the Descriptions of the Priority Levels. DED Section A specifies that SLA is to be defined for both data centers and counties. This is part of the minimum quality standard requirements all Saber deliverables must meet, and must be consistent on all Saber deliverables in progress and going forward. ASIM: 3/3/3007: It has already been agreed on the DED that the system availability plan will not address county issues, so why this issue has been raised? Isn't this redundant? The following identified as "Severe" issue:</p> <p>"Critical functionality failure exists with excessive risk to the ability of Colorado's election officials to use the SCORE II application system. System or application catastrophic failure has occurred or is very likely to occur imminently."This automatically covers security issue.This will be documented as an issues moving forward.</p>	Technical	Open
II-075	Sunday, April 8, 2007 5:30:27 PM	Tuesday, April 10, 2007 2:59:21 PM	<p>Saber delivered a Quality Management Plan and System Test Plan but the Saber Oregon and Colorado team clearly do not have a complete understanding of the roles that need to be performed, the use of terminology and artifacts to be delivered. The limited exposure to the documentation leads us to believe testing is performed but not according to any Industry Standard. The 2 Oregon testers have only been with Saber for less than 10</p>	Business	Open

	MDT	MDT	months. Neither of the testers has voter management or election experience. The QTP is limited is only the test scripts generated manually and the values are hard coded. Since the risk exposure is unclear at this time, the IV&V Team needs to ensure all code is exercise and should execute all proposed test cases.		
II-089	Monday, May 21, 2007 1:46:09 PM MDT	Monday, May 21, 2007 1:46:09 PM MDT	<p>The DED request a description of the processes employed to control the test effort. Test Plan needs more clarification on environment controls for the performance and security testing. Saber 4/6/07 - Issue will be revisited with next release of the updated test plan for performance and security testing. This will need to be carried forward as an issue as Saber is not addressing the subject in this release of the System Test Plan.</p> <p>The section does not address the recent issue where by a counties image data may not be converted in the two week wave plan for rollout. This information is needed to make sure the State and counties agree on the process. ASIM 5/17/2007: following line added: During data collection for dry run cycle, the image collection has taken up considerable time. When counties are rolled into production SCORE II, the voter images/signatures for counties might take a little more time for having these available in SCORE II. Since these pertain to existing voter records, the delay in having these available in production SCORE II does not really impact production preparedness for SCORE II. The SCORE IV&amp;V was looking for a statement that addressed the effort to be done in parallel with a subsequent waive. The inclusion of timing metrics or data could close this finding along with an understanding of a plan if all the images can not be migrated in the two week wave window. ASIM 5/24/2007: This is work in progress, Saber will provide this information soon. This finding will be carried as an issue and revisited with Saber during the weekly status meetings until closure can be reached.</p>	Business	Open
II-090	Wednesday, May 30, 2007 1:11:39 PM MDT	Tuesday, June 5, 2007 8:30:59 AM MDT	<p>State is verifying Scanners, Bar code readers and Label printers on the County equipment but using the Colorado FEQA architecture. The risk is IV&amp;V has seen environment configuration differences between Saber location and Colorado (production) location. "The lights are on but no guarantee of working in the correct environment."</p> <p>According to the delivered agendas, the following items should be covered during Training/UAT and were not: User Administration, User Roles, Election Payment, Election Worker, Election Close-out, Voter Activity, Mailings &amp; Labels (Process/Receive), State Agency Interface Processing, Import tabulation data from voting machines. When will this be addressed? Saber Comments: Added a line to the document on Page 8 that states Saber will provide the finalized agendas for UAT 3 &amp; UAT 4 separate from this document. Additional information does not cover the following specific items: User Administration / User Roles &amp; Responsibilities</p>	Business	Open
II-096	Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:10:38 AM MDT	Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:10:38 AM MDT	<p>Saber Comments: A working session with the state is needed to define the roles and privileges appropriate for SCORE II. CDOR State Agency Interfaces</p> <p>Saber Comments: This will be covered during final UAT. Document Updated Importing Tabulation Data</p> <p>Saber Comments: This may not be completed before Pilot Mock Election. Depending upon getting all required technical specifications from the tabulation device vendors, the development is expected to be complete before November 07. Each item will be tracked as issues moving forward. The Final UAT document should close all but the last issue dealing with the Voting Machine interface.</p>	Business	Open
II-097	Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:11:28 AM MDT	Tuesday, August 7, 2007 7:17:37 AM MDT	<p>UAT is focused on county users. UAT scope and depth for each module must include state users and their acceptance sign-off. When will this be addressed? Saber Comments: Added a line on Page 5 that states Saber will provide training for State level testing. Information was added to the document. This will be carried as an issue until the training occurs. The State needs to complete their policy / centralization discussions so Saber has a</p>	Business	Open

II-099	Tuesday, August 14, 2007 2:39:50 PM MDT	Tuesday, August 28, 2007 12:37:32 PM MDT	complete list of "State" functions. Missing voter status verification and political party verification.ASIM 6/28/2007: counties are still advised to do this on the phone calls.Unclear as to how this is documented in the process. Will the subsequent sign-off have additional information in this area?Puneet 07/31/2007: The counties are advised to use the "Additional Comment" area to report these or any other issues not covered by the checklist. The checklist, however is not updated.This will be tracked as an issue going forward and verified as part of the "go-live" migration.	Technical	Open
II-100	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:00:22 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:00:22 AM MST	A specific schedule for transition should be created for each of the Support areas. A longer "parallel" support time is required depending on the area. The plan needs to account for the extensive lead time for acquiring State personnel.Puneet 12/03: Recommendations addedThe schedule of transition events needs to be coordinated with the State. These events will depend on the level and type of support the State will continue to acquire through Saber.Puneet 12/15: Saber agrees that the schedule of activities mentioned are tentative only and will be finalized as the state decides the level and type of support through Saber. Details of saber Platinum Support program have been provided for review. At this point, no further action can be taken on this finding.This will be tracked as an issue for review over after Statewide implementation.	Schedule	Open
II-101	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:01:09 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:01:09 AM MST	Item 1. Citrix Administration - Needs to include both the hardware and software versions of the Citrix Access Gateway. Puneet 12/03: This would depend upon the application architecture at the time. This is currently in the works to implement software solution while the vendor is working on resolving issue on hardware. This will be tracked as an issue moving forward. Saber should include the solution that they believe will be implemented.	Technical	Open
II-102	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:02:35 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:02:35 AM MST	Item 5, Network and Security Components is missing major task for: Monitoring and Log Analysis, an essential component of a deployed system that is mission-critical.Puneet 12/03: Review of logs would be covered under routine support and maintenance activitiesThis will be tracked as an issue and a risk moving forward.	Technical	Open
II-103	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:03:53 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:03:53 AM MST	There should be a design template document for any interfaces files importing into SCORE or export from SCOREPuneet 12/03: All import and exports are application functionalities included in RFP requirements, UAT findings and Spirit issue logs.12/05: As discussed, the process flow overview of the agency (CDOR, CDOC and CDPHE) data interface process has been added to the document.Additional information is required.Puneet 12/15: As per discussion, specific reference to Interface discussion during Application Development training and for sample files has been added.This will be tracked as an issue moving forward and verified during the application training transition.	Technical	Open
II-104	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:05:34 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:05:34 AM MST	This document does not detail the security of the password(s) in scripts and the scripts themselves. Who has permissions to the scripts and how are the scripts stored (Encrypted / Clear text)? Or document where the information will be provided. This needs to be addressed in the next security test.	Technical	Open
II-105	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:11:35 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:11:35 AM MST	This document does not detail if the batch / SFTP process is a push or a pull script with all the different agencies.	Technical	Open
II-106	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:31:28 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:31:28 AM MST	Need documentation for the extract process of all the names and addresses of all registered voters to send to the NCOA. Will this include all addresses associated with a voter including "snow birds" who only live in the State part of the year.	Business	Open
II-107	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:33:44	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:33:44	The file transfer is indicated "on a regular basis". What specifically is the frequency for this transfer?	Business	Open

II-108	AM MST Monday, January 7, 2008 8:35:02 AM MST	AM MST Monday, January 7, 2008 8:35:02 AM MST	Need to document test strategies for Automated and Manual Processes. This can be addressed by again pointing to the document where the information will be contained.	Business	Open
II-109	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:38:24 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:38:24 AM MST	<p>The process for reinstating a felon voter needs to be documented. I.e. parolee process. A description of how records are removed from all the interface tables needs to be addressed. This will be used to address application performance questions over the long term. This needs to be addressed in the SCORE training.</p> <p>Due to the fact that some of the counties are running in parallel with their legacy systems, there may be a need to re-migrate pilot county data in its entirety or for the 2007 election. This needs to be addressed in the Statewide Rollout planning moving forward. Puneet 10/23/07: The discussion around this issue was that SCORE will be the primary application and all data will be kept in synch between the systems. While Arapahoe county is running election from their legacy system, it was discussed that only the voting history for this one election may need to be re-migrated - on the understanding that voter records will be maintained. The open issue would still be around mapping the voting credit to the correct new voter records added in both systems. This will be closed and carried as an issue moving forward. The re-migration or additional migration may not be isolated to Arapahoe, depending on the results of the elections.</p>	Business	Open
II-110	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:08:30 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:08:30 AM MST	<p>Spirit contains several issues that have not been resolved for the pilot counties. These issues need to be addressed and closed. Puneet 10/23/07: Most open issues are in this status because pilot counties have not verified the updates in DV instance. These are around audit log entries primarily. The response was that they would verify the data after election. This data does not impact / affect the election or any transactions being executed on the voter records. This will be closed and carried as an issue moving forward.</p>	Business	Open
II-111	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:09:30 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:09:30 AM MST	<p>The Pilot and Group folders do not contain the current counties assigned (Huerfano, Lincoln, and Routt). Mesa will also need to be re-assigned. Puneet 10/02/2007: Saber and CDOS are working together on finalizing the statewide rollout schedule for remaining 55 counties. The factors to consider are Sequoia System availability, data migration volume and number of users to train on SCORE for each group. This will be carried forward as an issue until the schedule is finalized. The grouping of the files is not important, only that all the counties are accounted for.</p>	Schedule	Open
II-112	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:15:47 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:15:47 AM MST	<p>Lessons learned from the Conversion Detailed Design were not applied to the non-pilot counties. The counties have problems during their go-live conversion based on the issues discovered during the pilot. This should include a formal sign-off with no exceptions outstanding. Puneet 10/02/2007: Saber has worked with all counties statewide to resolve all reported issues for counties statewide. A few counties have few open issues and questions on translation where Saber and CDOS are working together and coordinating with individual counties. This will be carried forward as an issue. The lessons learned document needs to be updated to include any and all issues identified in the pilot rollout process.</p>	Business	Open
II-113	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:17:29 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:17:29 AM MST	<p>Several counties are known to have no images including Pueblo, Delores, Costilla and Saguache. The information provided in this deliverable indicates that Montezuma does not have images as well. This needs to be explained. Puneet 10/02/2007: Saber received images from Pueblo and Saguache. CDOS have also contacted Delores and Costilla and these counties would be scanning their documents directly into the SCORE application after production go-live. Montezuma had some issue with their images that all documents received were corrupt and could not be migrated. The county was communicated on this as well. We have</p>	Business	Open
II-114	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:19:05 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:19:05 AM MST			

			contacted LEDS to work on re-collection and test the migration before production. Saber is not tracking this issue on their weekly status report. This issue needs some increased visibility so the issue does not affect any of the Statewide Rollout processing. The issue is now being tracked and addressed. This closes this finding.		
			Those fields that are requiring data changes to the legacy data do not indicate that a Voter Activity record is being written in SCORE. Puneet 10/02/2007: the audit logs are being created based upon (1) the history records received as part of legacy data and (2) voter records being filled in with missing / invalid required information like last name, DOB etc. The voter audit log module in the system identifies data of migration in the audit records as the date of conversion / roll over to SCORE production. The SCORE IV&V are verifying that the data has been added to voter activity records. This will be tracked as an issue moving forward. In a meeting with the State and Saber, the Elbert county record was provided. Saber indicated at the status meeting that Arapahoe's records were added to the database. This will be verified along with the other pilot counties in the future.		
II-115	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:21:28 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:24:15 AM MST	The activity is the last official deliverable related to Data Conversion. With the pending Votec extract changes, the data conversion and translation process will change for the Votec counties and the process needs to be revisited. Puneet 10/02/2007: There are still open questions on VOTEC data fields not included in the data extract - address library flags and multi-page TIFF. These are work in progress between CDOS, Saber and Votec. After receiving the details, this information will be migrated as "post processing" outside of the verified migration procedures / maps and would not change the existing procedure. Hence the validations would be minimal and focused on these changes and complete process would not require revisit / revalidation. The State and Saber are working through this issue and it has not been resolved to this point. Based on information provided by the pilot counties, the Votec Extract must be updated to accommodate the additional fields. Time must be allocated to testing the process before the Statewide Rollout begins in early December. This will be closed and tracked as an issue moving forward. The lessons learned in the pilot rollout and the county effort saved by implementing these changes can not be overlooked. A plan for implementing the Votec changes is needed.	Business	Open
II-116	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:25:29 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:25:29 AM MST		Business	Open



**Vendor Initial Deliverable Metrics:**

Deliverable Name	Deliverable Dates				Findings Status					Current Status
	Contract	DEF	Draft	Final	High	Major	Moderate	Low	Observation	
Project Plan	10/23/2006	11/2/2006	12/6/2006	12/18/2006	8	38	92	58	32	
Agency Interface Plan	10/23/2006	11/1/2006	11/22/2006	12/1/3/2006	1	6	37	6	11	
Organizational Change Management Plan	10/23/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	6	2	2	
Project Web-Site	10/23/2006	11/6/2006	1/16/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	6	3	0	
System Acceptance Criteria	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/4/2007	5	11	4	4	1	
System Test Plan	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/29/2007	12/15/2006	15	19	36	33	19	
Conversion Plan	11/13/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/3/2007	4	2	27	9	9	
Disaster Recovery Plan / Business Continuity Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	1/29/2007	12/27/2006	2	15	25	20	45	
Security Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	2/12/2007	1/30/2007	26	8	18	9	5	
Training Plan	11/27/2006	11/5/2006	1/19/2007	12/26/2006	0	15	13	7	8	
Detailed Design for Colorado Customizations	12/4/2006	11/13/2006	2/7/2007	3/7/2007	1	6	32	12	0	
Implementation Plan	12/4/2006	11/30/2006	4/30/2007	5/22/2007	0	4	12	5	1	
Technical Architecture Design	12/8/2006	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	13	17	25	12	15	
Pilot Test Plan	12/18/2006	11/17/2006	2/1/2007	1/8/2007	2	7	21	13	6	
System Availability Plan	12/19/2006	11/17/2006	1/17/2007	2/12/2007	3	8	20	5	4	
Application Requirements	12/22/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	2/15/2007	0	3	7	3	2	
Conversion Detail Design	2/9/2007	11/30/2006	3/26/2007	5/22/2007	0	0	13	0	1	
Prepare Pilot Counties	3/2/2007	1/31/2007	6/13/2007	7/6/2007	1	3	2	0	1	
Configure Software	3/30/2007	11/17/2006	4/12/2007	6/29/2007	0	1	0	0	0	
System Test	3/30/2007	11/13/2006	5/3/2007	7/19/2007	1	9	1	0	0	
Updated Detailed Design for Colorado Interfaces	3/30/2007	1/25/2007	2/15/2007	3/7/2007	0	8	12	3	2	
Updated Test Plan	3/30/2007	2/2/2007	3/22/2007	4/10/2007	1	16	14	1	4	
Integrated Development Environment	10/23/2006	11/3/2006	1/16/2007	1/30/2007	0	0	3	1	2	
Source Code	10/23/2006	11/7/2006	1/16/2007	1/3/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Duplicate Voter Check Criteria	TBD	12/5/2006	12/19/2006	2/23/2007	0	0	3	3	0	
Pilot Data Migration	4/20/2007	2/20/2007	5/15/2007	6/1/2007	0	1	7	0	0	
UAT Planning & Testing	3/27/2007	4/3/2007	5/4/2007	6/6/2007	0	2	7	4	0	
UAT / Pilot Training	4/20/2007	3/26/2007	7/10/2007	7/23/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Performance & Security Test	5/4/2007	2/8/2007	8/30/2007	9/10/2007	6	27	9	2	1	
Installation and Configuration Guide	2/1/2007	2/8/2007	5/31/2007	6/19/2007	2	6	8	1	1	
Verify Pilot Data Migration	3/7/2007	3/14/2007	6/28/2007	7/9/2007	0	9	3	3	2	
User Acceptance Test Plan	5/18/2007	7/11/2007	8/17/2007	9/5/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Duplicate Voter Check	6/1/2007	3/19/2008	4/16/2008	4/28/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Test Conversion	6/1/2007	6/13/2007	8/8/2007	8/30/2007	0	4	3	0	0	
Regression & System Test / Production Build	6/15/2007	4/11/2007	8/15/2007	8/27/2007	0	3	5	1	0	
Documentation	3/16/2007	3/23/2007	6/22/2007	6/27/2007	0	5	6	19	0	
Pilot Counties Data Migration	7/9/2007	6/25/2007	5/1/2007	10/2/2007	0	3	2	0	0	
Train Pilot Users	7/20/2007	8/27/2007	9/14/2007	9/24/2007	0	3	2	0	1	
SCORE II Pilot Readiness	7/21/2007	6/19/2007	8/3/2007	8/24/2007	0	5	7	2	3	
Pilot County Survey	8/24/2007	9/19/2007	8/16/2007	11/2/2007	0	1	4	0	1	
Data Centers GAP Analysis	11/24/2006	11/14/2006	11/15/2006	12/18/2006	1	4	3	2	8	
Hardware Installation - CDOS	12/15/2006	12/22/2006	8/6/2007	8/14/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Hardware Installation - e-Fort	3/2/2007	12/22/2006	4/9/2007	5/11/2007	0	0	6	0	1	
Hardware Procurement Plan & Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	3	3	7	0	8	
Software Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	2	2	2	0	9	
County Hardware Survey	2/2/2007	1/30/2007	2/13/2007	2/28/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Report Status / Status Meetings	5/1/2007	N/A	N/A	6/30/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Prepare Statewide Counties	11/16/2007	6/27/2007	4/17/2008	4/24/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Final Acceptance Testing/Mock Election	NEW	3/24/2008	5/15/2008	6/6/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Transition Plan	12/24/2007	10/22/2007	12/12/2007	12/24/2007	2	11	8	3	0	
Train End Users	3/18/2008	9/27/2007	4/10/2007	4/17/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Help Desk Plan	3/28/2008	6/11/2007	7/20/2007	7/30/2007	1	7	10	1	6	
Implementation Roll Out	3/28/2008	10/5/2007	3/31/2008	3/31/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Maintenance and Support Plan	3/29/2008	12/10/2007	3/10/2008	3/18/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
SCORE II Readiness	3/30/2008	10/8/2007	6/2/2008	6/16/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Totals					100	292	528	247	211	
		Accepted Deliverable			Conditionally Accepted		Rejected Deliverable			



**Vendor Current Deliverable Metrics:**

Deliverable Name	Deliverable Dates				Findings Status					Current Status
	Contract	DED	Draft	Final	High	Major	Moderate	Low	Observation	
Project Plan	10/23/2006	11/2/2006	12/6/2006	12/18/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agency Interface Plan	10/23/2006	11/1/2006	11/22/2006	12/1/3/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Organizational Change Management Plan	10/23/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Web-Site	10/23/2006	11/6/2006	1/16/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	6	3	0	0
System Acceptance Criteria	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/4/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
System Test Plan	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/29/2007	12/15/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conversion Plan	11/13/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/3/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disaster Recovery Plan / Business Continuity Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	1/29/2007	12/27/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Security Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	2/12/2007	1/30/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Plan	11/27/2006	11/5/2006	1/19/2007	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detailed Design for Colorado Customizations	12/4/2006	11/13/2006	2/7/2007	3/7/2007	1	6	32	12	0	0
Implementation Plan	12/4/2006	11/30/2006	4/30/2007	5/22/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Architecture Design	12/8/2006	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pilot Test Plan	12/18/2006	11/17/2006	2/1/2007	1/8/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
System Availability Plan	12/19/2006	11/17/2006	1/17/2007	2/12/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Application Requirements	12/22/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	2/15/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conversion Detail Design	2/9/2007	11/30/2006	3/26/2007	5/22/2007	0	0	3	0	0	0
Prepare Pilot Counties	3/2/2007	1/31/2007	6/13/2007	7/6/2007	0	2	0	0	1	0
Configure Software	3/30/2007	11/17/2006	4/12/2007	6/29/2007	1	9	1	0	0	0
System Test	3/30/2007	11/13/2006	5/3/2007	7/19/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Updated Detailed Design for Colorado Interfaces	3/30/2007	1/25/2007	2/15/2007	3/7/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Updated Test Plan	3/30/2007	2/2/2007	3/22/2007	4/10/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Integrated Development Environment	10/23/2006	11/3/2006	1/16/2007	1/30/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Source Code	10/23/2006	11/7/2006	1/16/2007	1/3/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Duplicate Voter Check Criteria	TBD	12/5/2006	12/19/2006	2/23/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pilot Data Migration	4/20/2007	2/20/2007	5/15/2007	6/1/2007	0	0	3	0	0	0
UAT Planning & Testing	3/27/2007	4/3/2007	5/4/2007	6/6/2007	0	2	7	4	0	0
UAT / Pilot Training	4/20/2007	3/26/2007	7/10/2007	7/23/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Performance & Security Test	5/4/2007	2/8/2007	8/30/2007	9/10/2007	6	27	9	2	1	0
Installation and Configuration Guide	2/1/2007	2/8/2007	5/31/2007	6/19/2007	0	3	4	0	0	0
Verify Pilot Data Migration	3/7/2007	3/14/2007	6/28/2007	7/9/2007	0	4	2	0	0	0
User Acceptance Test Plan	5/18/2007	7/11/2007	8/17/2007	9/5/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Duplicate Voter Check	6/1/2007	3/19/2008	4/16/2008	4/28/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Test Conversion	6/1/2007	6/13/2007	8/8/2007	8/30/2007	0	4	3	0	0	0
Regression & System Test / Production Build	6/15/2007	4/11/2007	8/15/2007	8/27/2007	0	3	5	1	0	0
Documentation	3/16/2007	3/23/2007	6/22/2007	6/27/2007	0	1	3	0	0	0
Pilot Counties Data Migration	7/9/2007	6/25/2007	5/1/2007	10/2/2007	0	3	2	0	0	0
Train Pilot Users	7/20/2007	8/27/2007	9/14/2007	9/24/2007	0	3	2	0	1	0
SCORE II Pilot Readiness	7/21/2007	6/19/2007	8/3/2007	8/24/2007	0	5	7	2	3	0
Pilot County Survey	8/24/2007	9/19/2007	8/16/2007	11/2/2007	0	1	4	0	1	0
Data Centers GAP Analysis	11/24/2006	11/14/2006	11/15/2006	12/18/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardware Installation - CDOS	12/15/2006	12/22/2006	8/6/2007	8/14/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardware Installation - e-Fort	3/2/2007	12/22/2006	4/9/2007	5/11/2007	0	0	6	0	1	0
Hardware Procurement Plan & Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Software Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	0
County Hardware Survey	2/2/2007	1/30/2007	2/13/2007	2/28/2007	0	0	0	0	0	0
Report Status / Status Meetings	5/1/2007	N/A	N/A	6/30/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prepare Statewide Counties	11/16/2007	6/27/2007	4/17/2008	4/24/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Final Acceptance Testing/Mock Election	NEW	3/24/2008	5/15/2008	6/8/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transition Plan	12/24/2007	10/22/2007	12/12/2007	12/24/2007	2	11	8	3	0	0
Train End Users	3/18/2008	9/27/2007	4/10/2007	4/17/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Help Desk Plan	3/28/2008	6/11/2007	7/20/2007	7/30/2007	0	4	6	1	0	0
Implementation Roll Out	3/28/2008	10/5/2007	3/31/2008	3/31/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maintenance and Support Plan	3/29/2008	12/10/2007	3/10/2008	3/18/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCORE II Readiness	3/30/2008	10/8/2007	6/2/2008	6/16/2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals					10	88	113	28	8	
		Accepted Deliverable			Conditionally Accepted		Rejected Deliverable			

## Risks:

RISKS										
RISK ID	ENTRY DATE	UPDATE DATE	ARTIFACT	IDENTIFIED RISK	PROJECT AREA	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	EXPOSURE	MITIGATING FACTORS / ACTIONS	STATUS
IVV-2	12/21/2005	1/12/2008		The counties decide to stay with their respective legacy systems as opposed to migrating to the State Wide Voter Registration System. Similar to the rogue county problems from other states.	Business	3	3	9	Keep the counties informed on the decisions being made on the project. Allow the counties to once again participate in the selection process. It is critical that the State continues to send a consistent message to the counties and the state of the project. 8/24/2007 - Steering committee decision where Mesa County decided no to go forward. A total of nine counties are moving forward in various forms of rollout. 10/6/2007 - The uncertainty of Arapahoe's participation in the pilot needs to be clarified. 12/21/2007 - The decertification of the voting equipment could have negative SCORE implementation affects due to county resources involved in both projects. 01/12/2008 - Login and transaction reports are indicating that the counties are not using the SCORE system as expected. This will be monitored closely over the course of the next three months.	Open
IVV-29	11/10/2006	11/9/2007		The Saber resources are being stretched thin by the acquisition of other states and or the process of going after additional states.	Schedule	2	3	6	Lock down resources early. Stay informed on the other state acquisition process. The proposed phased approach of software delivery is increasing the probability of this risk. Saber has indicated they have won Wyoming during the audit trip. Vote Center development is starting back up, competition for resources will most likely occur. Saber announced that their Colorado Functional Manager is being re-assigned to the Wyoming implementation project. Saber continues to provide the contract resources as needed for the critical phases of the project. 11/10/2007 - Additional Saber resources being added to the project to support the Statewide rollout.	Open
IVV-31	12/1/2006	9/1/2007		That the SCORE II Vote Center Application can be adequately stress tested during the UAT process. The system must be Stress tested according to industry standard in order to provide the necessary due diligence required by the counties that had issues during the last election. <b>Saber's performance testing results do not match the expectations established as part of the Updated Test Plan deliverable. Saber has used a tool that was not part of the proof of concept documentation. In addition, a load of only 700 users were tested on a part of the infrastructure forcing the results to be extrapolated for the full 5500. Saber does not have the necessary experience with the application to make this judgment.</b>	Technical	3	3	9	The meeting held of February 12th did not produce the desired results. Saber did not come to the meeting prepared to discuss the tools and approach as expected. The State will need to continue to put pressure on Saber to prove the 5500 user requirement. Mitigation Strategy: Independent Stress testing. The State has entered into negotiations with two companies to perform independent performance testing. 5/19/2007 - Saber has documented their Performance Testing Plans in the Updated Test Plan deliverable. Saber will conduct a "Proof of Concept" before the "official" Performance Test. 6/2/2007 - The State provided the IV&V with a copy of the two proposals for the Independent Performance Testing. 7/6/2007 - Performance and stress testing will be just in time due to product deliver, CDOS Data Center implications, and outside contract work. 8/3/2007 - Updated risk. 9/1/2007 - Saber has been asked to revisit the deliverable and perform another test. 11/03/2007 - The application has been adequately tested for the 2007 Election.	Open
IVV-36	1/26/2007	1/12/2008		During the Project Schedule DED review, Saber stated that another Load (Performance) Test would be added to the schedule. The current version only has one formal performance test scheduled (5/21/2007). Another test should be scheduled after or during the Pilot. Stress Tests independent of the standard Load/Performance Tests are also not specified in the Project Schedule. This should represent a Project Risk.	Schedule	3	3	9	Another load test needs to be planned, and executed after all counties are on the SCORE II system. 6/2/2007 - Due to the increased Citrix license requirement due to Early Voting Requirements, this risk needs to be revisited. 7/6/2007 - The SCORE IV&V is proposing an audit based on the increase of the number of Citrix Licenses and the potential application impact. 1/12/2008 - Due to the timing of the stabilization of the SCORE infrastructure, the P&S test will occur during the Mock Election period scheduled for April 2008.	Open
IVV-37	2/9/2007	6/2/2007		The SCORE IV&V could not find the info documented in the System Maintenance Guide of the DRP, Change Control Document of the DRP or the Technical Architecture Design. It is risky to assume that all Oracle or other software is fully patched. In addition, bugs or issues may occur over the duration of the project requiring patching. <b>In each case of a patch or bug for Oracle and other software it is not clear: 1. How is a patch tested? 2. Where is a patch tested? 3. If it is tested in production, what downtime occurs? 4. How is the patch removed from production if a problem is found after its application? 5. What contingencies are made for bugs without patches? 6. Is there a policy to apply patch sets rather than one off patches whenever possible? If this information is going to be provided in the Configuration Management Plan it should be indicated.</b>	Technical	3	3	9	The State must approve all changes to the SCORE system. Any proposed must be tested in a non-production environment. 6/2/2007 - The State needs to consider creating a "sandbox" environment for the purposes of testing SCORE infrastructure changes. This was discussed as part of the installation and configuration guide deliverable review.	Open
IVV-38	2/9/2007			The Disaster Recovery Plan scenarios provided by Saber fail to address any real world disasters e.g. catastrophic damage to a data center. This should have potential real world disaster scenarios.	Technical	2	3	6	The State needs to incorporate the SCORE II project in their Disaster Recovery Planning scheme. Within the State scenarios, a complete loss of a data center should be addressed.	Open

RISKS											
RISK ID	ENTRY DATE	UPDATE DATE	ARTIFACT	IDENTIFIED RISK	PROJECT AREA	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	EXPOSURE	MITIGATING FACTORS / ACTIONS	STATUS	
IVV-40	2/21/2007	11/9/2007	10/6/2007	Substantial security responsibility may fall into State's realm. Adherence to security best practices consistently found to be lacking, and even the most basic hardening steps such as scan/analyze/patch iterative refinements at a subsystem level are missing. Waiting until after 3/26/07 (per Wave Plan) to begin Independent Security Testing may be too late to patch holes uncovered at the device, system and network level for critical path milestones to be achieved.	Technical	3	3	9	Highly recommend appointing a State Security Officer for security officer 'perform', oversight, and governance duties. Independent Security Test will be used to address issues. 10/6/2007 - Based on the feedback from Saber on the IST, the number of issues that will not be implemented is minimal. 11/09/2007 - The initial IST tests were conducted. Follow-up continues with Saber on the Issues that are affecting the SCORE environment.	Open	
IVV-46	7/20/2007	1/12/2008		The lack of detailed design information on the Vote Center Web Module (Database Design, Technical Architecture, Disaster Recovery) limiting the States exposure to arguably the most critical component of the SCORE system. The information is needed to accurately test the system in the area of performance, security and disaster recovery.	Technical	3	3	9	Saber provide additional information and or a walkthrough of the final Architecture in lieu of the updated materials. 1/12/2008 - Saber has agreed to provide the requested Data Flow information. This will be tracked at each Saber Status meeting moving forward.	Open	
IVV-48	9/1/2007	1/12/2008		Citrix protocol errors continue to be a problem for the pilot counties. The errors have not been isolated despite the efforts of Saber and Citrix. The problems are beginning to erode at the counties confidence in the SCORE system.	Technical	3	3	9	Saber and the State need to have a "Sandbox" environment that would allow the testing of configuration changes to repair the problem. The State does not have a sandbox environment that includes the SCORE infrastructure. 10/6/2007 - The counties were polled and the larger counties continue to have problems despite the implemented changes. 11/03/2007 - Saber and Citrix met over the period to try to salvage the appliance Citrix Gateway before going back to the Software version. 11/24/2007 - Saber is has started conversion of Site 1 back to the Software version of the Citrix Gateway product. 12/15/2007: The last round of Citrix testing did not go as planned. These issues need to be addressed by Saber and a decision to move over to Site 1 according to the established deadlines in order to make the January deadline to be up on the full infrastructure. 1/12/2008 - Saber successfully moved back onto Site 1 utilizing the CSS. The move was not without incident due to the presence of connectivity strings in the pilot county client machines.	Open	
IVV-51	11/19/2007	1/12/2008	November 2007 Election	Saber is not demonstrating the configuration management expertise that is expected to manage an enterprise architecture. The problem discovered on election day with the database setting being too low to handle the expected low is an real time example of this issue. Without some additional process and discipline the SCORE infrastructure will continue to be in question.	Technical	3	3	9	Require Saber to demonstrate the same level of configuration management discipline the SCORE infrastructure as is being applied to the SCORE application. 1/12/2008 - Connectivity strings being overlooked in the Pilot county client machines during the site swap out.	Open	
IVV-52	11/19/2007		ISTP	Saber is not demonstrating their ability to monitor and respond to the SCORE log files. Their lack of a qualified tool and the lack of a response to know attacks puts the SCORE infrastructure at risk.	Technical	3	3	9	Saber acquires a tool for monitoring logs and continue to develop the "production" monitoring capabilities for the system.	Open	
IVV-53	12/18/2007	1/12/2008		The decertification of voting equipment will significantly change the way SCORE will be used in the November 2008 elections. The change could include legislation that would be adopted either during or immediately after the Statewide rollout planned for the first quarter of 2008.	Business	3	2	6	Adoption of an all mail ballot election for 2008 would simplify the use of SCORE for the November 2008 Elections. 1/12/2008 - The SOS has indicated that some of the voting equipment is likely to be re-certified in the 30 days window, and that pending legislation should additional address the issue.	Open	
				<b>Impact</b>							
				<b>Probability</b>	<b>1 - Negligible</b>	<b>2 - Marginal</b>	<b>3 - Critical</b>	<b>4 - Catastrophic</b>			
				<b>1 - Improbable</b>	1	2	3	4			
				<b>2 - Remote</b>	2	4	6	8			
				<b>3 - Probable</b>	3	6	9	12			
				<b>4 - Expected</b>	4	8	12	16			